

From: "Crawford, Jennifer" <Crawford.Jennifer@epa.gov>
To: Brady.Johnson@deq.idaho.gov
Date: 7/1/2020 12:42:11 PM
Subject: FW: Smoky Canyon cover option
Attachments: [Smoky Canyon cover considerations v2.docx](#)

Hi Brady,

I need to rewrite the overall EPA comment from the attached doc, but this is the basis of my cover/history questions to you. Steve's recommendation at Smoky is for a monolithic amended natural soil cover of root zone depth to support conifer forest vegetation for ET.

Thanks!

Jennifer

From: Rock, Steve <Rock.Steven@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2020 9:27 AM
To: Crawford, Jennifer <Crawford.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Lynch, Kira <lynch.kira@epa.gov>
Cc: Ford, Robert <Ford.Robert@epa.gov>; McKernan, John <McKernan.John@epa.gov>
Subject: Smoky Canyon cover option

Jennifer,

This review took longer than most because after looking at the cover options presented it seems that the best answer is "none of the above". They are all close and reasonable, but there is an obvious better choice. I tried to lay out the reasons why. I consulted with some experts who have actually worked on covers in the phosphate patch.

Please give me a call when you have a chance to read this.

Thanks,

Steve

Thanks,

Steve

Steve Rock
USEPA
26 MLK Jr. Dr.
Cincinnati, OH 45268
513-569-7149 office
513-382-4989 cell

"Knowledge is knowing that a tomato is a fruit. Wisdom is knowing that a tomato doesn't belong in a fruit salad." Miles Kington